



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | F        | ILING DATE    | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO.  |  |
|-----------------|----------|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--|
| 09/766,407      |          | 01/22/2001    | Ronald Martin Tanner | 56932.000007        | 56932.000007 7309 |  |
| 29315           | 7590     | 08/24/2004    | ,                    | EXAMINER            |                   |  |
| MINTZ LE        | VIN CO   | HN FERRIS GLO | BASOM, BLAINE T      |                     |                   |  |
| 12010 SUNS      | SET HILL | S ROAD        |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER      |  |
| SUITE 900       |          |               | ARTONI               | TATER NUMBER        |                   |  |
| RESTON VA 20100 |          |               |                      | 2173                |                   |  |

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



|   | Application No.   | Applicant(s)   | #   |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action   | 09/766,407  | TANNER ET AL.  | U   |  |  |  |  |
| ravioury riodion  | Examiner  | Art Unit   |   |  |  |  |  |
|   | Blaine Basom  | 2173   |   |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address   |   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 07 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (*condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearamentation (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.   | void abandonment of this application (i) a timely filed amendment whi   | cation. A proper replication can be called a cal | ly to a<br>ation in                                       |  |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR RE   | PLY [check either a) or b)]   |  | •   |  |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moderned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.7 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in | f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. So 136(a) and the appropriate the final Office action; or (  | ee MPEP extension fee ension fee under 2) as set forth in |  |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF  | R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal   | period set forth in of the appeal.   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b  |   |  | •   |  |  |  |  |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require furth  |   | (see NOTE below);  |   |  |  |  |  |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note  | •   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or  |   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| (d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:  | ling a corresponding number of  | finally rejected clain   | ns.   |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject  |   | ·  |   |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>  | l be allowable if submitted in a s  | separate, timely filed   | l amendment   |  |  |  |  |
| 5.⊠ The a)□ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)⊠ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se   |   | sidered but does NO  | T place the   |  |  |  |  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  | cause it is not directed SOLELY   | to issues which we   | re newly  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims were   | t(s) a) will not be entered or bould be rejected is provided be   | o) will be entered a<br>low or appended.   | and an  |  |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows   | <u>.                                    </u>  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:   |   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:   |   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected:  |   | <i>;</i>   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |   | •  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app  | oroved or b)□ disapproved by  | the Examiner.  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)   |   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Other:  |   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |  |   |  |  |  |  |

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner maintains that Traversat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,052,720, hereafter referred to as "Traversat") teaches creating and customizing a device image. The Applicants have submitted that Traversat fails to teach customizing application configurations, which as described in the previous Office Action, are considered to compose a device image. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As described in the previous Office Action, Traversat discloses a tree-like data structure, referred to as a "machine namespace," wherein under each manufacturer entry in the machine namespace exists a number of entries, particularly within a "platform" category, each entry representing a particular computer model made by the manufacturer and existing on the nework. Each of these entries is considered a "device image," like recited in the claimed invention, as there exist a plurality of leaf nodes associated with each entry, whereby each leaf node specifies the application configurations of the applications stored on the associated computer model. Contrary to the Applicants' assertions, this image may be customized. For example, as described in the previous Office Action, the configuration information for a computer model entry may be augmented or overridden by configuration information maintained by a "profile category," a "users category," and a "group category," as described in the previous Office Action. Such a technique allows a customized device image to be sent to the user's computer (for exampe, see column 9, lines 42-67).

CAO (KEVIN) NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER